

March 4, 1980

LB 383

feel justified in cancelling those, so we are faced with six bills for tomorrow. I hope you will be prepared to process these in due time.

PRESIDENT: All right, we will proceed then with bills on General File, agenda item #6, starting out with LB 383.

CLERK: LB 383 was introduced by the Judiciary Committee and signed by its members. (Read title.) The bill was read on January 17 and referred to the Constitutional Revision and Recreation Committee. It was advanced to General File. I have no amendments, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Nichol.

SENATOR NICHOL: Mr. Chairman, members of the Legislature, LB 383 was introduced by the Judiciary Committee last year as a companion bill to the judge's salary bill. Senator Reutzel, did you hear that? Because of the form of final passage of the judge's salary bill, LB 383 was no longer needed for that purpose. However, it has come to my attention that this provision in the Constitution often serves as a stumbling block whenever the Legislature is dealing in those areas relating to the salaries of public officials and public officers. I believe it is for the above reason that the Constitutional Revision Committee passed this legislation onto the floor and at this time I would like to give Senator Reutzel the opportunity to explain the action taken by the Constitutional Revision Committee in regard to LB 383 and the reasons for its current need. I believe it may apply to the sheriffs' bill. Senator Reutzel, I just wanted you to have the opportunity if that is the case or if it isn't the case, what is the case?

PRESIDENT: Senator Reutzel.

SENATOR REUTZEL: Mr. President, members of the body, the reason the committee put the bill out, it is a Judiciary Committee bill and it was a companion bill to the judge's salary which unfortunately got 30 votes last year, but we don't need it for that reason now, but I do think the reason that the committee put it out, there was some discussion, the fact that this could be used for a vehicle for the sheriffs' salaries, and in some counties we do have a problem as we all know that the salaries for the sheriffs have been too low and has caused a great deal of turnover. Now 383, if passed...put on the ballot and passed, could alleviate that problem because as it is now there are some county boards which in my opinion are not living up to